

REMARKS

Claims 1-58 remain in the application for consideration. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

Claim Objections

Claims 30 and 55 are objected to because "WAP" is an acronym and should be defined for better understanding. Applicant has amended these claims to obviate this objection.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 1-58 stand rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,537,526 to Anderson et al. (hereafter "Anderson") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,564,263 to Bergman et al. (hereinafter "Bergman"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,556,217 to Makipaa et al. (hereinafter "Makipaa").

Before undertaking a discussion regarding the substance of the Office's rejections, the following discussion of the § 103 Standard is provided.

The § 103 Standard

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Second, there must be a reasonable expectation

1 of success. *In re Merck & Co., Inc.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir.
2 1986). Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach
3 or suggest all the claim limitations. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580
4 (CCPA 1974). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and
5 the reasonable expectation of success *must* both be found in the prior art, not in
6 applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1439 (Fed. Cir.
7 1991).

8 Hence, when patentability turns on the question of obviousness, the search
9 for and analysis of the prior art includes evidence relevant to the finding of
10 whether there is a teaching, motivation, or suggestion to select and combine the
11 references relied on as evidence of obviousness. See, e.g., *McGinley v. Franklin*
12 *Sports, Inc.*, 262 F.3d 1339, 1351-52, 60 USPQ2d 1001, 1008 (Fed. Cir. 2001)
13 ("the central question is whether there is reason to combine [the] references," a
14 question of fact drawing on the Graham factors). The mere fact that references *can*
15 be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless
16 the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d
17 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). "To support the conclusion that the
18 claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must
19 expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or *the examiner must*
20 *present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found*
21 *the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the*
22 *references.*" *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 USPQ 972, 973 (Bd.Pat. App. & Inter.
23 1985)(emphasis added).

24 Chapter 2100 of the MPEP provides further instruction as follows: "With
25 regard to rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103, the examiner must provide evidence

1 which as a whole shows that the legal determination sought to be proved (i.e., the
2 reference teachings establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness) is more probable
3 than not." See MPEP 2142.

4 "The factual inquiry whether to combine references must be thorough and
5 searching." *Id.* It must be based on objective evidence of record. This precedent
6 has been reinforced in myriad decisions, and cannot be dispensed with. See, e.g.,
7 *Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. Philip Morris Inc.*, 229 F.3d 1120, 1124-
8 25, 56 USPQ2d 1456, 1459 (Fed. Cir. 2000) ("a showing of a suggestion,
9 teaching, or motivation to combine the prior art references is an 'essential
10 component of an obviousness holding'" (quoting *C.R. Bard, Inc., v. M3 Systems,*
11 *Inc.*, 157 F.3d 1340, 1352, 48 USPQ2d 1225, 1232 (Fed. Cir. 1998)); *In re*
12 *Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d 994, 999, 50 USPQ2d 1614, 1617 (Fed. Cir. 1999) ("Our
13 case law makes clear that the best defense against the subtle but powerful
14 attraction of a hindsight-based obviousness analysis is rigorous application of the
15 requirement for a showing of the teaching or motivation to combine prior art
16 references."); *In re Dance*, 160 F.3d 1339, 1343, 48 USPQ2d 1635, 1637 (Fed.
17 Cir. 1998) (there must be some motivation, suggestion, or teaching of the
18 desirability of making the specific combination that was made by the applicant); *In*
19 *re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1075, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988) ("teachings
20 of references can be combined only if there is some suggestion or incentive to do
21 so.") (emphasis in original) (quoting *ACS Hosp. Sys., Inc. v. Montefiore Hosp.*,
22 732 F.2d 1572, 1577, 221 USPQ 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984)); *In re Fritch*, 23
23 USPQ2d 1780, 1784 (Fed. Cir. 1992) ("It is impermissible to use the claimed
24 invention as an instruction manual or 'template' to piece together the teachings of
25 the prior art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious. [O]ne cannot use

1 hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior
2 art to deprecate the claimed invention.”) (quoting *In Re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071,
3 1075, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988)).

4 The need for specificity pervades this authority. See, e.g., *In re Kotzab*,
5 217 F.3d 1365, 1371, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (“*particular*
6 *findings must be made as to the reason the skilled artisan, with no knowledge of*
7 *the claimed invention, would have selected these components for combination in*
8 *the manner claimed*”).

9 In view of the guidance provided above, Applicant disagrees with the
10 Office’s obviousness rejections and respectfully submits that the Office has not
11 made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully
12 requests withdrawal of these rejections.

13 The Claims

14 **Claim 1** recites a web content adaptation method comprising:

- 15
- 16 • analyzing one or more functions associated with a webpage; and
 - 17 • adapting the webpage for presentation on a device based on said
18 analyzing.

19 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office asserts that its subject
20 matter would have been obvious in view of the teachings of Anderson, Bergman,
21 and Makipaa. First, the Office argues that it would have been obvious to modify
22 Bergman into Anderson “to provide simple and composite objects and define
23 presentation relationship of an object, as taught by Bergman, incorporated into the
24 object oriented framework of Anderson, in order to provide a *unified framework*.”
25

1 (emphasis added). Next, the Office notes that Anderson and Bergman “do not
2 explicitly disclose ‘adapt the webpage for presentation on a second device type
3 that is different from the first device type.’” The Office refers to Makipaa and
4 asserts that it discloses “adapting page to be displayed based on the device
5 capabilities.” The Office then argues that it would have been obvious to have
6 “modified Makipaa into Anderson and Bergman to provide a way to adapt a page
7 *based on device capabilities*, as taught by Makipaa, incorporated in the systems of
8 Anderson and Bergman, in order to allow *maximum utilization* of a device for the
9 user.” (emphasis added).

10 Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that there would have been no
11 motivation to modify Bergman into Anderson. Specifically, the Office has failed
12 to present a convincing line of reasoning (as required by 35 U.S.C. § 132 (see also
13 MPEP 706.02(j))), that is stated with particularity and which explains *why* it
14 would have been obvious to incorporate these teachings. To support the
15 conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either
16 the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the
17 examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would
18 have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of
19 the references. See, e.g. *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 USPQ 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. &
20 Inter. 1985).

21 The Office’s attempt at a convincing line of reasoning is to state simply that
22 the combination would be motivated “in order to provide a *unified framework*”.
23 As noted above, *particular* findings must be made as to the *reason* the skilled
24 artisan, with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would have selected these
25 components for combination in the manner claimed. *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365,

1 1371, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

2 Here, the Office has not explained what a "*unified framework*" is, or even
3 why it would have been desirable to provide one. Perhaps more importantly, the
4 stated motivation "provide a *unified framework*" appears to simply pertain to
5 improving efficiency. This motivation could, however, be used to justify almost
6 any modification of Anderson and fails to explain *why* the proposed combination
7 with Bergman would have been obvious. Thus, the Office has not made particular
8 findings as to the reason the claimed subject matter would be obvious in view of
9 the cited references.

10 Furthermore, even if Makipaa does disclose "adapting page to be displayed
11 *based on the device capabilities*", Applicant fails to see how this is pertinent to the
12 subject matter of this claim. According to the Office, the *adapting* in Makipaa is
13 based on the *capabilities of the displaying device*, not on "*analyzing one or more*
14 *functions associated with a webpage*", as claimed.

15 Finally, Applicant respectfully submits that there would have been no
16 motivation to modify Bergman and Anderson with Makipaa. Again, the Office
17 has not presented a convincing line of reasoning explaining *why* it would have
18 been obvious to incorporate the teachings of these references. The Office's
19 attempt at a convincing line of reasoning is to state simply that the combination
20 would be motivated "in order to allow *maximum utilization*". Again, this
21 motivation merely pertains to improving efficiency, and could be used to justify
22 almost any modification of Anderson and Bergman. Once again, the Office has
23 not made particular findings as to the reason the claimed subject matter would be
24 obvious in view of the cited references.

25 Additionally, and as an aside, the Office has provided a paper, available at

1 the following link:

2 <http://www.uspto.gov/web/menu/busmethp/busmeth103rej.htm>

3
4 that describes proper and improper rejections made under §103(a).
5 Particularly instructive is an example that appears in Section V of the paper
6 illustrating an improper §103(a) rejection which is based upon hindsight in view of
7 a general motivation statement. This example is reproduced below in its entirety
8 for the Office's convenience:

9 **V. Examples of Improper Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103**

10 Example 17: Improper rejection based upon hindsight - general motivation
11 statement.

12 **a. The claimed invention**

13
14 The invention is drawn to a smart card containing a tracking mechanism,
15 which tracks shopping preferences of consumers by recording the type, quantity,
16 and dates of purchase for a pre-selected group of products. The smart card is
17 useful in a system and method for introducing new and alternative products that
18 are of the same type as products normally purchased by the shopper. The smart
19 card records the shopper's purchases and submits an automatic notification to the
20 shopper when a quantity threshold is achieved for the pre-selected products. This
21 notification will encourage the consumer to consider alternative products by
22 providing the consumer incentives, such as a pricing discount, to purchase an
23 alternative product.

24 **Claim 1:**

25 A method for using a smart card in a marketing analysis program designed
to introduce new products, the method comprising the steps of:

storing product information on the smart card when said products
are purchased by a consumer wherein said information including type,
quantity and dates of the product purchased;

identifying for each product a threshold for each of said type,

1 quantity and dates of products purchased;

2 determining an incentive for an alternative product based on said
3 threshold; and

4 automatically notifying said consumer when said threshold is
5 reached for a given product identified on the smart card and providing the
6 consumer with said incentive, whereby the incentive encourages the
7 consumer to consider alternative products.

8 b. Evidence

9 Reference A discloses smart card that tracks consumer preferences by
10 recording the type, quantity, and dates of purchase of pre-selected products to
11 determine trends in consumer purchases. The smart card is periodically read by a
12 scanner to determine its contents for market analysis. In return for using the smart
13 card and participating in the marketing program, the user is provided with free
14 product coupons for products that are normally purchased by the shopper.

15 Reference B discloses a traditional consumer incentive program that
16 provides coupons for the purchase of named products based upon the consumer's
17 purchase of those same products to promote customer loyalty.

18 c. Poor statement of the rejection

19 Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over
20 Reference A in view of Reference B. Reference A discloses the conventional use
21 of a smart card to track consumer preferences and provide incentives. However,
22 Reference A does not disclose the automatic notification to consumer providing
23 incentives. Reference B discloses providing incentives to consumers to purchase
24 the desired products. It would have been obvious to combine Reference A's
25 smart card with Reference B's incentive to consumers because the combination
would allow Reference A's smart card to be more *efficient*.

26 d. Analysis

27 The motivation, *improve efficiency*, is too general because it could cover
28 almost any alteration contemplated of Reference A and does not address *why this*
29 *specific proposed modification would have been obvious*. Additionally, there is
30 nothing in either of references that would suggest automatically notifying the
31 consumer when reaching a threshold nor is there anything in either reference that
32 would suggest the notifying step. Finally, although Reference B teaches a
33 traditional coupon scheme to promote customer loyalty, there is no suggestion,
34 other than applicant's disclosure, to employ this scheme to promote the
35 introduction of new and alternative products. **The rejection is improper.**

1 In the present rejection, the Office's stated motivations are similar to the
2 Office's own example of an improper rejection. In the Office's own words: "[t]he
3 motivation, improve efficiency, is too general because it could cover almost any
4 alteration contemplated ... and does not address *why* this specific proposed
5 modification would have been obvious." Therefore, the Office's rejection is
6 improper.

7 In view of the above discussion, the Office's rejection is misplaced and
8 does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Hence, for at least these
9 reasons, this claim is allowable.

10 Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an
11 allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
12 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither disclosed
13 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
14 another.

15 Claim 6 recites a web content adaptation method comprising:

- 16
- 17 • analyzing one or more functions associated with a webpage that is
configured for presentation within a first client environment; and
 - 18 • based on said analyzing, adapting the webpage for presentation
within a second client environment that is different from the first
19 client environment.
- 20

21 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office relies on the same
22 argument that it made in regard to claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees with
23 the Office and maintains that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of
24 obviousness. Hence, for at least these reasons, this claim is allowable.

25 Claims 7-15 depend from claim 6 and are allowable as depending from an

allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 6, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 16 recites a web content adaptation method comprising:

- analyzing one or more functions associated with a webpage that is configured for presentation on a first device type, said analyzing being performed by generating one or more function-based object models that represent objects comprising the webpage,
 - said objects comprising:
 - one or more basic objects associated with the webpage, basic objects comprising a smallest information body that cannot be further divided, said one or more basic objects being configured to perform one or more of the following functions: (1) providing semantic information, (1) navigating to other objects, (3) providing a visual effect on the webpage, and (4) enabling user interaction; and
 - one or more composite objects associated with the webpage, composite objects comprising objects that contain other objects, said one or more composite objects having a clustering function that is associated with a webpage author's intention; and
- based on said analyzing, adapting the webpage for presentation on a second device type that is different from the first device type.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office relies on the same argument that it made in regard to claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Hence, for at least these reasons, this claim is allowable.

Claims 17-25 depend from claim 16 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 16, are neither disclosed

1 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
2 another.

3 **Claim 26** recites a web content adaptation method comprising:

- 4
- 5 • analyzing one or more functions associated with a webpage by
6 generating one or more function-based object models that represent
7 objects comprising the webpage,
 - 8 ○ said objects comprising:
 - 9 ▪ one or more basic objects associated with the webpage, basic
10 objects comprising a smallest information body that cannot be
11 further divided, said one or more basic objects being
12 configured to perform one or more of the following functions:
13 (1) providing semantic information, (1) navigating to other
14 objects, (3) providing a visual effect on the webpage, and (4)
15 enabling user interaction; and
 - 16 ▪ one or more composite objects associated with the webpage,
17 composite objects comprising objects that contain other
18 objects, said one or more composite objects having a
19 clustering function that is associated with a webpage author's
20 intention; and
 - 21 • based on said analyzing, adapting the webpage for presentation on a
22 device.
- 23

24 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office relies on the same
25 argument that it made in regard to claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees with
the Office and maintains that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of
obviousness. Hence, for at least these reasons, this claim is allowable.

Claims 27-28 depend from claim 26 and are allowable as depending from
an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
features which, in combination with those recited in claim 26, are neither disclosed
nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
another.

1 **Claim 29** recites one or more computer-readable media having computer-
2 readable instructions thereon which, when executed by one or more processors,
3 cause the one or more processors to:

- 4
- 5 • analyze one or more functions associated with a webpage that is
6 configured for presentation on a first device type by generating one
7 or more function-based object models that represent objects
8 comprising the webpage,
 - 9 ○ said objects comprising:
 - 10 ▪ one or more basic objects associated with the webpage, basic
11 objects comprising a smallest information body that cannot be
12 further divided, said one or more basic objects being
13 configured to perform one or more of the following functions:
14 (1) providing semantic information, (1) navigating to other
15 objects, (3) providing a visual effect on the webpage, and (4)
16 enabling user interaction; and
 - 17 ▪ one or more composite objects associated with the webpage,
18 composite objects comprising objects that contain other
19 objects, said one or more composite objects having a
20 clustering function that is associated with a webpage author's
21 intention;
 - 22 ○ said generating of the one or more function-based object models
23 comprising generating at least one function-based object model
24 for a basic object, said at least one function-based object model
25 being generated as a function of one or more of the following
properties: (1) a presentation property that defines a way in
which the object is presented, (2) a semanteme property
associated with content of an object, (3) a decoration property
pertaining to an extent to which the basic objects serves to
decorate the webpage, (4) a hyperlink property pertaining to an
object to which the basic object points via a hyperlink, and (5) a
interaction property pertaining to an interaction method of the
basic object;
 - said generating further comprising generating at least one
function-based object model for a composite object, said at least
one function-based object model for the composite object being
generated as a function of one or more of the following
properties: (1) a clustering relationship property pertaining to a
relationship among root children of the composite object, and (2)
a presentation relationship property pertaining to a presentation

- order associated with the root children of the composite object;
- said generating further comprising generating at least one specific function-based object model that serves to categorize an object by:
 - for a basic object, generating said at least one specific function-based object model based upon properties of the basic object and properties associated with any father or brother objects; and
 - for a composite object, generating said at least one specific function-based object model based upon properties of the composite object and any of its root children; and
 - based upon an analysis of said one or more functions, adapt the webpage for presentation on a second device type that is different from the first device type.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office relies on the same argument that it made in regard to claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Hence, for at least these reasons, this claim is allowable.

Claim 30 depends from claim 29 and is allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 29, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 31 recites a web content adaptation method comprising:

- receiving multiple web pages that are configured for display on a first device type;
- processing the multiple web pages to provide multiple different objects associated with the webpages, individual objects having one or more properties relating to functions of the individual object;
- applying one or more rules to the objects sufficient to provide multiple different webpages that are configured for display on a second device type that is different from the first device type.

1
2 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office relies on the same
3 argument that it made in regard to claim 1. Applicant is confused in regards to the
4 applicability of the Office's reasoning in claim 1 to this claim. Specifically, the
5 Office has not argued that all the elements of this claim are obvious. Applicant
6 therefore traverses this rejection and respectfully reminds the Office that "it is
7 important that the written record clearly explain the rationale for decisions made
8 during prosecution of the application," MPEP 706.02 (j)). Applicant requests that
9 the Office properly communicate the basis for its rejection of this claim.

10 Nevertheless, the references cited by the Office do not teach or suggest all
11 the subject matter of this claim. Additionally, as discussed above, the Office has
12 not made particular findings as to the reason the claimed subject matter would be
13 obvious in view of these cited references. Hence, for at least these reasons, this
14 claim is allowable.

15 **Claims 32-42** depend from claim 31 and are allowable as depending from
16 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
17 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 31, are neither disclosed
18 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
19 another.
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 **Claim 43** recites a web content adaptation method that adapts web content
2 from one format to another, and which uses multiple function-based object models
3 to do so, where the function-based object models comprise models that pertain to
4 (1) basic objects that comprise a smallest information body that cannot be further
5 divided, and (2) composite objects that comprise objects that can contain other
6 objects.

7 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office relies on the same
8 argument that it made in regard to claim 1. Applicant is confused in regards to the
9 applicability of the Office's reasoning in claim 1 to this claim. Specifically, the
10 Office has not argued that all the elements of this claim are obvious. Applicant
11 therefore traverses this rejection and requests that the Office properly
12 communicate the basis for its rejection of this claim.

13 Nevertheless, the references cited by the Office do not teach or suggest all
14 the subject matter of this claim. Additionally, as discussed above, the Office has
15 not made particular findings as to the reason the claimed subject matter would be
16 obvious in view of these cited references. Hence, for at least these reasons, this
17 claim is allowable.

18 **Claim 44** depends from claim 43 and is allowable as depending from an
19 allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features
20 which, in combination with those recited in claim 43, are neither disclosed nor
21 suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
22 another.

1 **Claim 45** recites a system for adapting web content from one format to
2 another comprising one or more function-based object models, individual
3 function-based object models representing objects that are present in a webpage in
4 terms of one or more of an object's functional properties.

5 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office relies on the same
6 argument that it made in regard to claim 1. Applicant is confused in regards to the
7 applicability of the Office's reasoning in claim 1 to this claim. Specifically, the
8 Office has not argued that all the elements of this claim are obvious. Applicant
9 therefore traverses this rejection and requests that the Office properly
10 communicate the basis for its rejection of this claim.

11 Nevertheless, the references cited by the Office do not teach or suggest all
12 the subject matter of this claim. Additionally, as discussed above, the Office has
13 not made particular findings as to the reason the claimed subject matter would be
14 obvious in view of these cited references. Hence, for at least these reasons, this
15 claim is allowable.

16 **Claims 46-53** depend from claim 45 and are allowable as depending from
17 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
18 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 45, are neither disclosed
19 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
20 another.

21 **Claim 54** recites a computer architecture for use in adapting web content
22 for display on a computing device, the architecture comprising:

- 23
- 24 • an analysis module for receiving at least one webpage and
25 processing the one webpage to produce one or more function-based
 object models that describe functional properties of objects that are

contained in the one webpage;

- one or more rules modules that contain rules that are to be used to adapt content contained in the webpage; and
- a content adaptation module configured to process the one or more function-based object models in accordance with one or more rules contained in the one or more rules modules to produce a new web page that has been adapted from the one web page.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office relies on the same argument that it made in regard to claim 1. Applicant is confused in regards to the applicability of the Office's reasoning in claim 1 to this claim. Specifically, the Office has not argued that all the elements of this claim are obvious. Applicant therefore traverses this rejection and requests that the Office properly communicate the basis for its rejection of this claim.

Nevertheless, the references cited by the Office do not teach or suggest all the subject matter of this claim. Additionally, as discussed above, the Office has not made particular findings as to the reason the claimed subject matter would be obvious in view of these cited references. Hence, for at least these reasons, this claim is allowable.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 3/14/05

By: 

Lance R. Sadler
Reg. No. 38,605
(509) 324-9256